



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,953

07/08/2003

Young-Gook Ha

3364P116

7127

8791

7590

03/20/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

FABER, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/614,953	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID FABER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 18 December 2007.
2. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, and 12 have been amended.
3. The rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornelia et al (US Patent #6,065,026, patented 5/16/2000) further in view of Person et al (Person et al, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Word 97", published 12/16/1996, pp 1-15, 16-20) in further view of Brauer et al (US PGPub 2001/0014900, published 8/16/2001) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornelia et al further in view of Person et al in further view of Brauer et al in further view of Hughes ("Stoking the AbiWord Fire", published 2/4/2002, pp 1-2) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 12 are independent claims.

### ***Specification***

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The phrases "computer-readable recording media" and "programmable processor" are not found to have proper antecedent basis in the specification; however it is necessary to use this terminology in order to properly define the claim within the boundaries of statutory subject matter. In order to overcome the object, an amendment to the specification is necessary constituting a non-exhaustive

statement of what the phrase “computer-readable recording media” or “programmable processor” would be as it would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in order to verify that the term “computer-readable recording media” and “programmable processor,” could not be taken in the context of non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-7, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

8. As per independent Claim 1, Claim 1 recites “a display” within the claim limitations. The Examiner is unable to find the disclosure of the element or the term “a display” within the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 1-7, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

**For your reference, below is a section from MPEP 2105 :**

(a) Functional Descriptive Material: "Data Structures" Representing Descriptive Material Per Se or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings Per Se  
Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions.

Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. Office personnel should determine whether the computer program is being claimed as part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such a case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim. The same result occurs when a computer program is used in a computerized process where the computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer program. Only when the claimed invention taken as a whole is directed to a mere program listing, i.e., to only its description or expression, is it descriptive material per se and hence nonstatutory.

**Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program's instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(b), below. When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.**

11. Claims 1-7, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims appear to be claiming “software systems” i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is a computer program per se. Since the claims disclose computer program per se that is not embodied on a computer readable medium, they appear non-statutory.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornelia et al (US Patent #6,065,026, patented 5/16/2000) further in view of Person et al (Person et al, “Special Edition Using Microsoft Word 97”, published 12/16/1996, pp 1-15, 16-20) in further view of Brauer et al (US PGPub 2001/0014900, published 8/16/2001) in further view of Poole et al (US Patent 6,006,242, patented 12/21/1999)

As per independent Claim 1, Cornelia et al discloses a system comprising:

- A document generation rule formulator process that a user employs to designate document rules through a graphic user interface on a display coupled to the computer system (Col 6, lines 13-20; line 66 – Col 7, line 3: User is able to designate rules to components that are used to create documents through a graphic user interface, a tree viewer. When the user selects which components are to be included into the document, the user is

- designating document generation rules (i.e. assembly rules) of which components are to be assembled into the document. Thus the assembly rules disclose what components are to be assembled into the document.)
- a document component library for storing and managing document component summary information and document components that represent specific concepts; (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 2: discloses a library used for storing components which are used to be assembled to create new documents. In addition, Column 9, lines 44-49, discloses Find Component menu option that is able to display a component dialog disclosing the component's name, description, author, text content, etc. Since the component contains all this information and displays it, the library stores components that contain summary information which represent specific concepts.)
  - a component assembler process for processing the assembly rules and assembling said document components from the document component library. (Column 20, lines 60 – 65: discloses a component assembler of creating documents by dragging and dropping language component icons where each icon represents a component. The components are stored in the library. (Col 2, line 66 – Col 3, line 2) Therefore, since the user is designating assembly rules by choosing which components are included in the document, the documents are assembled from the components chosen (assembly rules) from the library.)

- Creating a grammar neutral document object from the assembled document components (Column 20, line 64 – Column 21, line 4: Once the components have been assembled, a document is created.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose the document generation rules include context rules, and a context processor for processing context rules. However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used by formulation rules where the template created allows the user to easily enter information onto ASK or FILLIN field by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4) Since the user is only required to fill out the ASK or FILLIN fields on the form, then context rules are applied. This process acts as a context processor that discloses an embodiment using a template showing context conditions allowing the user only have to point, click, and type information in a already constructed form by the template's context rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

In addition, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose a document grammar connector process for converting the grammar neutral document object, which



is suitable for processing in a program of the computer system, into a grammar-connected document that is in a human-readable string form used in an actual business. However, Brauer et al discloses the functionality of converting computer readable documents (i.e. word processor documents) into a structured markup (XML) document. (Abstract, lines 1-7; Paragraph 0001) Brauer et al's invention converts objects (such as hard formatting objects and content data) of a computer readable document into defined XML objects of an XML-document (Paragraph 0073-0074) thus generating a grammar connected document. This process acts as a document grammar connector. An XML document is inherently considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods with Brauer et al's method since it would have providing a created XML document that contains hard formatting properties where the content and style properties of the XML-document are easily amended.

Furthermore, Cornelia et al, Person et al and Bauer et al fail to specifically disclose business context rules, a document for a specific type of business, and wherein the business context rules includes context conditions for acting on text for a specific business context. However, Poole et al discloses specifying content to be included into a document is to meet certain business rules and regulations wherein the content fragments of the document have integrity by virtue of being compliant with one or more business requirements. (Col 5, lines 3-7, 18-21) Thus, Poole et al discloses the content

must follow all the conditions specified by the rules to be included in the document, wherein the rules describe a specific business context for the content in the document to be made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's, Person et al's, and Bauer et al's methods with Poole et al's method since it would have provided the benefit of creating dynamic documents that may be replicated to gain repeated benefit of flexibility of using one method while customizable to follow business rules and regulations.

As per dependent Claim 2, Claim 2 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Cornelia et al discloses:

- a component selector for displaying usable component items that are provided by a corresponding library based on document component summary information searched in the document component library, the document component summary information including at least a component ID, a component name, and a component type, and optionally including various different types of information that represent other components; (Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses able to using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information such as the component's name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched. The user is able to insert components into the document from the component list.)

- a document component assembler for forming an area where component structures are modeled based on user input through said graphic user interface, the user dragging the needed document components appearing in the component selector and dropping the documents at a suitable location in the document component assembler to thereby generate document structures such structures are formulated as said assembly rules (Column 20, line 60 – Column 21, line 4: Discloses documents being created by dragging and dropping components into a list for the document using a tree viewer. Once the list been created, the word document with complete content is generated by a user action. This creation creates a structured document containing components placed in a structural manner. Therefore, since the user is designating assembly rules by choosing which components are included in the document, the documents are assembled from the components chosen (assembly rules) from the library.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose the assembly rules include IDs of all document components and structural information between each component; and disclose a context condition compiler for forming an area where context conditions realized through pairs of conditions and actions are compiled to enable insertion into document structures, the context condition compiler enabling the formulation of context rules, which allow the processing of actions, in the document generation rule processor in the case where conditions are satisfied for a specific business context during document assembly.

Cornelia et al discloses the author has the ability to get a listing of all the components in the document that displays component identifiers such as the component's name. (Column 11, lines 51-58) Since Cornelia et al's application is built using Microsoft Word (Column 6, lines 22-47), Cornelia discloses the ability of Word being able to view the assembled document with the components and the structured order of how the document components appear (Column 11, lines 52-65). Therefore, Word would be able to include the identifiers using the Show Document Components menu option from Cornelia et al's application since it was built using Microsoft Word.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's with the use of identifiers since it would have allowed using computers to assemble documents to reduce the amount of time that attorneys and other individuals who prepare long legal or transactional documents spend on the mechanics of document preparation.

Furthermore, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used by the formulation rules where the template created allowing the user to easily enter information by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool

one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 3, Claim 3 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose the assembly rules and the context rules are output as a single document generation rule. However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al discloses a specific type of a form template, where assembly and context rules are used together in which the assembly rules are used create a table that creates a form while the context rules are used for font size and font type for the text. (FIG 6.2) thus a template is a single document generation rule involving the combination of assembly and context rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 4, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- the document component summary information for recording the document components that constitute business documents and detailed information on all components included in a present library; and ; (FIG 26; Column 12, line

- 65 – Column 13, line 1: Discloses the ability to view one component from the library which discloses detailed component information that is used for business purposes (Column 6, lines 43-47)
- a component library interface for connection to external modules, (FIG. 3; Column 5, lines 27-38: Discloses the word processor, as a separate module, having an API that interacts with the library object which interacts with the library.)
  - the document generation rule formulator searches the document component summary information through the component library interface, and the document generation rule processor uses document component ids to accumulate document components required for document assembly. (Column 6, lines 6-12 discloses the interaction using the library. This disclosure enables using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information such as the component's name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched then allowing the author to insert the component into document thus outputting onto the document. (Column 9, lines 42-52))

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically discloses the component ids are numbers specific to each component. However, it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that a number can be a name and that identifiers were programmed as/into numbers within a data structure .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with the disclosure of numbers used as name as identifiers since it would have allowed a user an easier method for storing data within a recording medium.

As per dependent Claim 5, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- wherein the document components stored in the document component library include simple components of a single type and complex components realized through a structure of a plurality of simple components. (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 2 discloses a library containing components which are unit of text that is shared among documents. A component may contain variable text in order to facilitate flexibility and foster re-use. (Column 2, lines 48-50) Column 10, lines 8-34 discloses adding variable text into the component.)

As per dependent Claim 6, Claim 6 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Cornelia et al discloses a system:

- a component assembler is to read the assembly rules into the document generation rules and use document component IDs to accumulate from the document component library the document components required in the assembly rule, resulting assembled components are outputted. (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 2; Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses using a Find

Component menu option to find components based on the component's information such as the component's name in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched then allowing the author to insert the component into document thus outputting onto the document.)

In addition, Cornelia discloses the ability to assemble a document by choosing the components, and be able to change the order of the components listed in the document. (Col 14, lines 14-15) However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose assembling the document components using structural information between components. However, Person et al discloses that Microsoft Word contains structural information between each component when present such as the paragraph markings shown in FIG 10.3. Between each component, a paragraph mark is shown thus showing structural information is used to separate the components. (Pages 16-20) Therefore, since Cornelia et al's application is built off of Microsoft Word, Word would have been able to determine the structural information between each component when components are assembled.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Cornelia et al's method of document creating using components with Person et al's disclosure of Word's detection of structural information since it would provided the benefit of identifying the components from each other when just viewing the document without any other functions.



In addition, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose the context processor for reading the context rules in the document generation rules, and if a specific business context satisfies the conditions of the context rules, applying designated actions to the assembled components to thereby ultimately generate the grammar neutral document object. Furthermore, Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used by the formulation rules where the template created allowing the user to easily enter information by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4) This process acts as a context processor that discloses an embodiment using a template showing context conditions allowing the user only have to point, click, and type information in a already constructed form by the template's assembly and context rules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent Claim 7, Claim 7 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Cornelia et al discloses a document output unit saving final documents to the library after creating a document with components (Column 15, lines 49-57) for business uses (Column 6, lines 43-47) However, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose a grammar

converter supporting grammar for specific business systems and converting the grammar neutral document object into grammar-connected document objects.

However, Brauer et al discloses the functionality of converting computer readable documents (i.e. word processor documents) into a structured markup (XML) document. (Abstract, lines 1-7; Paragraph 0001) Brauer et al's invention converts objects (such as hard formatting objects and content data) of a computer readable document into defined XML objects of an XML-document (Paragraph 0073-0074) thus generating a grammar connected document. This process acts as a document grammar connector. An XML document is inherently considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods with Brauer et al's method since it would have providing a created XML document that contains hard formatting properties where the content and style properties of the XML-document are easily amended.

As per independent Claim 8, Claim 8 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and 6, and is similarly rejection under rationale. Furthermore Cornelia et al discloses a method comprising:

- (a) storing document component summary information and document components that represent specific concepts; (Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, lines 1-2: discloses a library storing components used to be assembled to create new documents. In addition, Column 9, lines 44-49, discloses a option

- within Cornelia et al's application of a Find Component function that able to display a component dialog disclosing the component's name, description, author, text content etc. Since the component contains all this information and displays it, the library stores components that contain summary information which represent specific concepts.)
- (c) accumulating document components needed for document assembly from a document component library according to the assembly rules, and generating grammar neutral document objects (Column 20, lines 60 – Col 3, line 2: discloses creating documents by dragging and dropping language component icons where each icon represents a component. Documents are created by the dragging and dropping components into a list for the document thus creating non-grammar objects within a document. When the user selects which components are to included into the document, the user is using assembly rules of which components are to be assembled into the document, which the rules are designated based on the user's selection.)

In addition, Cornelia et al and Person et al fail to specifically disclose converting the grammar neutral document objects, which are suitable for processing in a program of a computer system, into grammar-connected documents in a human-readable string form used in an actual business. However, Brauer et al discloses the functionality of converting computer readable documents (i.e. word processor documents) into a structured markup (XML) document. (Abstract, lines 1-7; Paragraph 0001) Brauer et al's invention converts objects (such as hard formatting objects and content data) of a

computer readable document into defined XML objects of an XML-document (Paragraph 0073-0074) thus generating a grammar connected document. This process acts as a document grammar connector. An XML document is inherently considered as a recognizable string format by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's and Person et al's methods with Brauer et al's method since it would have providing a created XML document that contains hard formatting properties where the content and style properties of the XML-document are easily amended.

As per dependent Claim 9, Cornelia et al discloses a method:

- displaying a list of usable components provided library based on the by a corresponding document component summary information searched in the document component library; (Column 9, lines 42-52: Discloses using a Find Component menu option to find components based on the component's information in which the system returns with a list of components in the library based on the component's information searched.)
- dragging required documents appearing in a component selector and dropping the documents at a suitable location in a document component assembler, which forms an area where component structures are modeled based on user input through the graphic user interface, to thereby generate document structures; and (Column 20, line 60 – Column 21, line 4: Discloses documents being created by dragging and dropping components into a list for

the document using a tree viewer. Once the list been created, the word document with complete content is generated by a user action. This creation creates a structured document containing components placed in a structural manner.)

However, Cornelia et al fails to specifically disclose compiling context conditions realized through pairs of conditions and actions, and allowing insertion of the context conditions into document structures. However, Person et al discloses Word contains templates, which contain parts of a document and features used for a specific type of document. (Page 1) Person et al's discloses where context conditions are used by the formulation rules where the template created allowing the user to easily enter information by requiring only the user just to point, click, and type to fill out a form. (Page 4, Paragraph 4; FIG 6.4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Cornelia et al's method with Person et al's disclosure of templates since Person et al's disclosure of using a Microsoft Word template is a tool one could have used to further increase efficiency, productivity, and consistency while reducing company's costs when creating a document.

As per dependent claim 10, Claim 10 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 11, Claim 11 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

14. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornelia et al (US Patent #6,065,026, patented 5/16/2000) further in view of Person et al (Person et al, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Word 97", published 12/16/1996, pp 1-15, 16-20) in further view of Brauer et al (US PGPub 2001/0014900, published 8/16/2001) in further view of Poole et al (US Patent 6,006,242, patented 12/21/1999) in further view of Hughes ("Stoking the AbiWord Fire", published 2/4/2002, pp 1-2)

Cornelia et al discloses that the document created can support a variety of word processor formats; however, Cornelia et al, Person et al, and Brauer et al fail to disclose the grammar neutral document object(s) are Extensible Markup Language documents. However, Hughes discloses a word processor, Abiword, which its word processor format is in XML. (pg 2, paragraph 2)

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Cornelia's invention with Abiword's word processor format since it would have provided the benefit of word processors gaining in portability and compatibility to exchange data between different applications.

### ***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments filed 18 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 7, in regards to Applicant's argument of claims 1-7 rejected under 35 USC 101, Applicant argues the claims therefore comply with the statutory subject matter requirement. However, Claims 1-7 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 101. The specification failed to disclose or mention a display or what is included a computer system at all; thus, the claims are viewed as software in view of data structures. The use of the word "system" does not inherently mean that claim is directed to a machine. Therefore, the claims, themselves, lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se. Thus, in regards to claims 1-7, the claims, as written, appear to be claiming "software systems" i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is computer program per se. The claims as written do not recite any hardware indication, therefore, viewed as "software systems".

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Arguments address regarding the new limitations of Claims 1, 8, and 12 brought forth in the amendment of business context rules, a document for a specific type of business, and wherein the business context rules includes context conditions for acting on text for a specific business context has been viewed the new ground of

rejection of 35 USC 103(a) under new references using Poole et al.

### ***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

